**FILED** 

## NOT FOR PUBLICATION

AUG 13 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

## FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MIGUEL SOSA SANCHEZ; BLANCA ESTELA SOSA,

Petitioners,

v.

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 06-73673

Agency Nos. A079-523-900 A029-523-901

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted August 11, 2009\*\*

Before: KLEINFELD, M. SMITH, and IKUTA, Circuit Judges.

Miguel Sosa Sanchez and Blanca Estela Sosa, spouses and natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of the Board of Immigration

Appeals' ("BIA") order denying their motion to reconsider. Our jurisdiction is

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. Reviewing for abuse of discretion the denial of a motion to reconsider, *Cano-Merida v. INS*, 311 F.3d 960, 964 (9th Cir. 2002), we dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review petitioners' challenge to the agency's discretionary determination that they were ineligible for cancellation of removal. See Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft, 327 F.3d 887, 890 (9th Cir. 2003).

The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioners' motion to reconsider because the motion failed to identify any errors of fact or law in the BIA's April 11, 2006, order denying their previous motion to reopen. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(b)(1).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.